

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough review and consideration of the subject Application. The Non-Final Office Action of January 14, 2004, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Claims 1-17 and 20 are currently pending in this Application. Claims 1-4, 6-13, and 15-17 have been amended to better conform with U.S. practice. Claim 20 is newly added. Support for these amendments are provided in at least Figures 2-6 and related text of the specification. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the above amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,624,857 issued to Nagata, *et al.*, ("Nagata"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 9 is allowable over the cited reference in that claim 9 recites a combination of elements of elements including, for example,

a plurality of first driving modules which are electrically connected between the integrated printed circuit board and the data lines so as to transmit the first driving signal to the data lines; and

a plurality of second driving modules having a plurality of driving signal line groups that are electrically connected to the gate lines, the second driving modules are electrically connected to the integrated printed circuit board through signal transmission lines formed on liquid crystal display panel, and the second driving modules transmitting the second driving signal to the gate lines.

Nagata does not teach at least these features.

More specifically, Nagata does not teach, the "first driving modules which are electrically connected between the integrated printed circuit board and the data lines" as required by claim 9.

Also, Nagata does not teach, "a plurality of second driving modules having a plurality of driving signal line groups that are electrically connected to the plurality gate lines, the second driving modules are electrically connected to the integrated printed circuit board through signal transmission lines formed on liquid crystal display panel" as required by claim 9.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 and claims 10-17, which depend from claim 9, are allowable and request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,590,624 issued to Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,945,948 issued to Kuwashiro. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), subject matter developed by another person which qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) shall not preclude patentability under 35 U.S.C. § 103 where the subject matter in the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same persons or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. As set forth in MPEP § 2146, for patent applications filed prior to November 29, 1999, 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) is limited to subject matter developed by another person which qualifies as prior art only under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) and 35 U.S.C. § 102(g).

The Examiner is respectfully directed to the following,

Effective November 29, 1999, subject matter which was prior art under former 35 U.S.C. § 103 via 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is now disqualified as prior art against the claimed invention if that subject matter and the claimed invention "were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person." This change to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) applies to all utility, design and plant patent applications filed on or

after November 29, 1999, including continuing applications filed under 37 CFR § 1.53(b), continued prosecution application filed under 37 CFR § 1.53(d), and reissues.

See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 706.02(l)(1) (8th Ed., Rev. Feb. 2003)

Applicants respectfully submit that at the time the invention was made, the invention was owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. More specifically, at the time the present invention was made, the present invention was owned by or subject to an obligation of assignment to Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd, which is the same assignee as recited in the Lee reference.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of claims 1-8.

Newly Added Claims

In this response, claim 20 is newly added in order to capture the subject matter of the invention from different perspectives. This claim is directed to the features fully described in the specification, but not disclosed or suggested in the art of record.


CONCLUSION

Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: May 14, 2004

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:SJH/jeh